Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

VOL. X, No. 24 JANUARY 22, 1951 $2.00 per year; 10 cents per copy

Christian Honesty in Communist Lands

ONE of the many problems growing steadily more acute for Christians in our divided world is that created by the increasing number of pro-communist statements by eminent Christians in iron-curtained lands. A less known recent report from supposedly democratic France adds some Latin Christian names to the list of those who have appeared in public utterances as supporters of the communist view, e.g., of the Korean war or as advocates of the Stockholm peace appeal.

When dealing with the Christians in areas where communist governments seek to domesticate or shackle the churches, certain considerations apply which do not apply to French Christians or any of similar viewpoints in other non-communist lands.

In the first place, unhappily, it is never possible to be sure what the truth is about published statements of Christians residing where no one is really free. So many instances have been known of mutilated statements that one has to reserve judgment when coming upon a pro-communist statement from even an old friend now behind the iron curtain.

It is always necessary likewise to keep in mind the fact that there is neither freedom of speech in the full sense nor freedom of silence under Communism. Therefore, one never knows whether statements issued by Christians within communist areas are voluntary or forced—directly or indirectly, for example, the recent statements by Christians in China, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, etc.

Next, one must remember that the use of what are known as "white lies" even by conscientious Christians in ordinary social contacts may give some clue to the seemingly sincere praise of Communism more and more frequently found in the writings of Christians in dominated lands.

Yet again, one who has not lived under the psychological roof of totalitarianism and experienced the mental air-conditioning that goes on under that roof needs constantly to be reminded of the impossibility of knowing the real facts when dependent upon communist propaganda organs. The power of this constantly reiterated "big lie" is shockingly evident. To be sure, there is propaganda to be encountered in the free world. But there are all kinds of correctives available and free inquiry is possible as to the real facts behind any given political situation.

Once more it must be recalled that part of the standard communist technique for dealing with churches involves the planting of spies within Christian ranks, the removal of strong leaders, and their replacement by weak ones easily controlled. This will have more and more effect in the days to come. It has been most marked in the case of the Orthodox Churches whose top leaders in certain lands have been ousted by charlatans who have no merit excepting their slavish adherence to the Moscow line. Infiltration into Christian mission activities in certain areas of China is likewise well established.

There is furthermore always in all Christian dealing with Communism a distinct danger that idealistic communalism—such as was practiced (with economically disastrous results) down through the ages by groups of self-effacing though nobly well disposed Christians—is confused with the Leninist-Stalinist concoction. This latter does not even claim to have reached the stage of communism but is a mixture of socialism, state-capitalism, Russian imperialism and despotism with what Professor Toynbee calls "the worship of mass man" (in the abstract) since no man is worthful as such and, to quote a prominent communist at the U.N. "the age of the hero and the individual has passed." (Stalin seems to be an exception to this rule.)

If these are considerations that relate to the present situation, what are the reasons for the need of some carefully thought-out policy? There is a good illustration in the denunciations of the World Council's approval (through its Central Committee) of the police action of the U.N. Such denunciations have come from Christian leaders in iron curtain lands and have been echoed even in France by Christians.

This provides a real challenge to whatever techniques the Christian world may have for dealing with a problem of partly ecclesiastical rather than purely political consequence.

We can ignore these statements as reflecting the

pathetic ignorance of our fellow Christians who have no access to the facts as we know them from competent and disinterested witnesses in Korea. Or we can try to answer them in such a way as to point out clearly the grounds of actions taken by churches in the West with respect to this burning issue on which now seems to hang the future of the U.N. and even of the peace of the world.

If from private advices (as is often the case) we know that prominent persons in Christian churches abroad have gone on record most emphatically in dissent from basic communist ideas and decidedly qualified their public statements concerning communist achievements, we do them scant kindness to give these facts to the Christian public here as an offset to the amazing statements appearing in the press. On the other hand, if we do not, what of the effect on the Christian witness in general? Is it morally right to permit Christians here to be misled when they could be informed as to the truth about the whole view of their colleagues now under communist domination?

It is known that in many cases Christians have signed general statements critical of the West generally and America in particular, as well as of the missionary enterprise (to which they owe their education, their faith and their present posts) not because they believed the statements to be true but only because if they did not, they would be unable to continue in the leadership of Christian work. On balance, they have chosen what seemed to them the less evil course. If this fact is known and those possessing the information give it to the American public, it would tend to neutralize the effect of the statements mentioned. But what of the effect on the conscientious compromisers who did the signing?

If without ignoring their statements, we communicate with the writers of such protests in a noncommittal way without referring to their statements, we may seem to be approving what we know to be wholly misguided judgments based not on truth but on communist lies so many times repeated that they have come to be believed widely throughout the communist world.

If we protest and give our reasons, we must realize that we place the recipients of our communications in a fearfully dangerous position. They are already regarded as non-communist at heart and therefore to be neutralized if not banished or destroyed when the opportune moment comes. Communications sent them cannot be so guarded as to avoid the prying eyes of communists.

If, on the other hand, we seek to bring authors of such documents to sit down face to face with Christians from the free world and to discuss the issues over which there is such difference of view, we expose them even more certainly to very real dangers.

It is plainly a terrific dilemma the answer to which needs more than incidental or casual consideration on our part. There has never been, save under Hitlerism, anything really resembling this situation. In the case of Hitlerism the period of uncertainty was not very long: and we were more often assured then of the reality of resistance, the maintenance of confidence, and the continuance of a genuine community of spirit than we have been under the longer period of Stalinist domination.

A hazard which has to be run lies in the certainty that any general discussions of policy vis-a-vis Christian groups in communist lands is certain to reach the knowledge of Moscow's spies, partly through gullible Christians who still lend themselves to communist schemes such as the promotion of the Stockholm "peace" appeal.

As if this were not in itself a sufficient difficulty, we must realize that a common language does not exist as between the communists and the Christians today. Every dynamic word is used in a different sense on two sides of the curtain. Witness such terms as "freedom," "democracy," "the people," "peace," "aggression," "war-monger," "truth," "justice," "civilization," "progress" and "reaction."

Denis de Rougement has brought home to us with great cogency the world's desperate need for a common vocabulary. Here is one of the places where it is most needed and where its absence is most deplorable. There may be some help to be found in the fact that for Christians everywhere a common vocabulary exists in the Bible and the traditional terminology of Christian history. The day came in our dealing with the Christians in Germany when we were shut up to the use of the Biblical illusions in seeking to communicate. The Books of Daniel and Revelation proved very useful indeed. It may be that we have practically reached that stage now with the leaders of communist-dominated churches. But even this presents tremendous risks of misunderstanding on both sides as well as of a person on the communist side.

It is clearly a problem to which intensive study must be devoted. We may hope that such seminar courses on Christianity and Communism, as the one soon to begin at Union Seminary in New York, may give a helpful lead to perplexed seekers after understanding among Christians on both sides of the iron curtain.—HENRY SMITH LEIPER.

Author in This Issue

Richard M. Fagley is Director of the Department of International Justice and Goodwill of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America.

Christianity and Crisis, Vol. X, No. 24, January 22, 1951. Published bi-weekly for 24 consecutive issues; beginning the third Monday in September by Christianity and Crisis, Inc., 537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y. Subscription price: U.S.A., $2.00; Canada, $2.25. Great Britain, 12s. 6d. Re-entered as Second Class matter May 6, 1949, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Responsibility and Foreign Policy

RICHARD M. FAGLEY

AS we face the perils and alarms of a new year, surely the keynote in our thinking on American foreign policy is represented by the term responsibility. Irresponsibility is the perennial danger of youth, and in a nation thrust so suddenly and so ill-prepared into a position of world power it is the greatest single threat to effective leadership among the non-communist societies.

A responsible foreign policy is one which takes into full account the basic and long-range national interests. It must serve the nation's security, but more important, it must serve the principles which give the nation significance. The freedom we cherish is more than "the liberty of our people," which Senator Taft would make the cornerstone of our foreign policy. It is the cause of human freedom which is the dynamic principle of our heritage. If that should cease to be a fundamental American interest, our own liberty would soon wither and atrophy, whatever our military strength. Responsibility means, in the first instance, a policy grounded on moral principles.

A responsible foreign policy is one which faithfully honors our national commitments, within the limitations imposed by our capabilities. In our interdependent world, the only possible security is a collective security, for the most powerful as for the weakest of nations. The mutual protection which flows from the mutual obligations of the United Nations and of the Atlantic community is the source of such safety as can be found in this very insecure time. To talk blithely of a unilateral "reexamination" of our relations with these larger communities with a view to reducing or reneging on our commitments is to trifle with the safety, as well as the good faith, of the Republic.

A responsible foreign policy, in the light of Christian teaching, is one which recognizes that national power is a trust to be used in the service of the general welfare. The great power now held by the United States, so often regarded among us as a mark of our collective virtue and a consequence of our individualistic economic theory, is rather a measure of the great obligation laid upon us to help bear the burdens of those who are weak. To discuss constructive projects for human betterment with some sarcastic reference to Santa Claus, as is now rather common on Capitol Hill, is sadly to ignore this test of responsibility which derives from religious faith.

These three brief and partial attempts to define responsibility in foreign policy can at least serve to remind us of some of the dangers which spring from our national immaturity in world affairs. In many respects they are more to be feared than the external menace of Soviet imperialism. In any case, they increase that menace tremendously.

The main weakness in our foreign policy appears to be the lack of a clearly defined, integrated, and unitedly held long-range strategy in international relations. In the period between wars, we were a sorely divided people on foreign policy, only half aware of our power and even less aware of our responsibilities. The overt attack upon us brought unity for victory, and eventually for the United Nations. But many of the wartime political decisions look like hasty improvisations. The long-range objectives and strategy do not stand out.

The same may be said with less force of the major postwar undertakings: the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, the North Atlantic Pact, Point IV. This is not to question the validity of the programs as such. The first three staved off impending catastrophes in Europe. The last is a promising pointer in the direction of a coherent long-range policy—except that it is far from securing as yet the strong and united support of the government and people. What is missing in all this is the sure sense of grand strategy, of a strategy for freedom which masters events, rather than is dictated by them.

Perhaps the evolution of such an overall strategy is inevitably a slow process in a democracy. Perhaps it requires the hard education of much experience. The fact remains that the lack of a clear sense of direction, in this time which calls for great leadership, has left others unsure of us, and us unsure of ourselves.

The present three-fold crisis in confidence is a prime example. In June, when the Security Council, on our initiative, authorized the first international military sanctions against an aggressor, it was recognized that one of the obvious contingencies which could defeat the United Nations undertaking was a large-scale intervention by the Chinese Communists. Fifty-three nations agreed that, on balance, the risk was worth running. Yet now that this foreseen, if not prepared-for, contingency is taking place, in a secondary theater of the global conflict, confidence in our leadership has suffered a serious reverse in Europe, in Asia, and here at home. The Kremlin could hardly have hoped for such results.

Harold Callender reports from France in the *New York Times* of January 7:

> "Overwhelming evidence points to a widespread distrust of the United States foreign policy, despite much friendly feeling towards Americans and aims of their policy. A large proportion of French citizens appears to suspect that the United

States suffers from inexperience in world leadership and that it feels unsure of itself and where it is headed. . . . The impression here is that it (isolationism) has been vigorously resurrected under the stress of the Korean War, and that it threatens to split the United States in the midst of the greatest world crisis of our time."

One ironic fact about this situation is that a major motive for the U. S. initiative in the U.N. action in Korea was undoubtedly to convince the Russians and the Europeans that isolationism was dead in this country and that aggression anywhere would be resisted.

The new yearning for neutrality in some European quarters can be attributed only in part, of course, to doubts about American policy. The expressed fear that the United States may involve the U.N. too deeply in an Asiatic war conceals somewhat a larger fear that the Soviet leaders, having turned to military aggression, may be preparing aggressions in Europe. Many Europeans have counted so heavily on the success of measures short of war, that the specter of new war comes as a shock. The realization that the American ability to stage a strategic counter-attack would not, in the event of war, prevent Soviet occupation of their countries does nothing to dispel this specter.

Yet these are insufficient to explain the present mood of doubt that endangers our relations with Western Europe. The threat of Soviet military aggression is not new. Nor are the obstacles to a system of static defenses along the 20,000 miles of Iron Curtain. The main new factor, as Mr. Callender and others report, is the fear that the American people are seriously divided on foreign policy, and that the isolationism of the inter-war years is being revived by men like Messrs. Hoover and Taft.

The crisis in our relations with Asia is much less sharply defined and much less closely related to the military reverses in Korea. These reverses, according to dispatches from Hong Kong, have reduced Western prestige to a very low point. But this reaction seems as superficial as the credence given in some quarters to Soviet propaganda about American "imperialism" in Korea. A more significant attitude in Asiatic circles appears to be one of distrust in the wisdom of our policies and disbelief in the genuineness of our concern for Asia's welfare. Despite initial support for the U.N. action in Korea, Asiatic leaders tend to regard the Soviet Union and the United States as irresponsible poles of conflict, as upper and nether millstones between which the peoples of Asia are caught.

This is not, of course, a new attitude. It is one aspect of the long-term and fundamental problem of achieving a new basis for community between Asia and the West. The Point IV proposals and the United Nations plans for expanded programs of technical assistance in the development of underdeveloped peoples, constituted a promising beginning towards a solution of this great problem. But the plans thus far evolved envisage a very slow and gradual development, in keeping with the size of the obstacles. Asia's needs, on the other hand, are immediate and pressing, particularly in view of the mounting Communist pressures. The United States, because of preoccupation with military needs and because of partisan dissension in the Congress, has failed thus far to keep Point IV in the forefront of American policy and to provide the vigorous international leadership required to fulfill its promise. This failure has no doubt been noted well by Asiatic leaders.

The desire of Nehru and other Eastern leaders to play a neutral, or rather a mediating, role in relations between the Soviet Union and the West, is closely connected with a crisis in the United Nations, brought to a head by the Chinese Communist aggression in Korea. Two unresolved concepts of the U.N. are brought into sharp conflict in the present controversy over whether to condemn Red China as an aggressor or to make new efforts to reach a negotiated settlement with the Communist regime. The United States, which is laboring for economic and diplomatic sanctions against the Peiping regime, supports the thesis that the U.N. is an organization of states "which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations" (Article 4). It is an organization for collective security against aggression, and not primarily a meeting ground between peace-loving states and aggressors. Thus, the United Action for Peace resolution, adopted this fall by the General Assembly, provides an alternative procedure to the Security Council for achieving this collective security purpose.

India, on the other hand, stresses the thesis that the primary function of the U.N. is to provide a center for negotiation, for "adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace" (Article 1). In this view, the U.N. needs to be inclusive in its membership, to assure continuing discussions among the major contending parties. Thus, the present Truce Committee and Indian proposals for recognition of the Chinese Communists as a step towards U.N. membership fit in with this concept of the U.N.

There is no easy solution for this difference over the function of the U.N. For the present world conflict is both a conflict of law and order against aggression and violence, and a conflict of power blocs. It is not enough to dismiss the Indian position, which seeks to mediate between the two blocs, as fuzzy-minded and an appeasement of aggression. To maintain the fragile bridges of negotiation be-

tween the two worlds is part of a responsible policy. It is well to recall not only the arguments of churchmen, but also those of government leaders, in behalf of an inclusive U.N., to make it truly the "town meeting of the world" and to bring about open discussions of international disputes.

To seek a showdown in the U.N. on the question of Chinese Communist aggression without careful and thorough international discussions on how best to reconcile the collective security and collective negotiation functions of the U.N. could hardly be the course of wisdom. To insist, in the face of the warning from the British Commonwealth leaders, on making this question the test issue for the survival of the United Nations, is not a decision to be taken hastily. As Walter Lippman wrote on January 9:

> "To be sure, if we all decide that the United Nations has dissolved of moral flabbiness because our best allies in this world do not wish to underwrite our proposal (denunciation of Red China as an aggressor and a recommendation of some form of limited war against her), then no doubt, if we insist on it, the United Nations can be dissolved. But we may still hope that we are capable of something better than the futile rages of a frustrated child."

Our immaturity as a nation in foreign policy is shown nowhere better than in the domestic crisis precipitated by the set-back in Korea. The spate of propaganda for scuttling the United Nations, for breaking with allies in the North Atlantic community, for retiring to some hemispheric "Gibraltar" —such talk has revealed how uncertain we are as a people about our role in the world.

As Mr. Dulles has pointed out, the crisis arose in the first place as a result of the successes of the free societies in turning back the expansionist drive of the Kremlin through non-military means. Confronting the success of the Marshall plan and similar programs, the Kremlin turned to military means, "aggression by proxy." The unanimity of the non-communist world in condemning this open resort to violence has reflected the moral judgment of mankind—a factor of no mean importance in the scales of history.

In the second place, the overwhelming majority of the United Nations followed the initiative of the United States in authorizing and supporting the first international police action. Despite the difficulties of transporting and integrating the different national contingents in the U.N. forces, men from a dozen countries in varying numbers have fought and died with men of Korea and of America. The patterns of a collective defense have been fashioned in battle. The initial aggressors have been defeated, and the Soviet pretense of a civil war has been abandoned in the large scale intervention of the Chinese communist armies. Tragic as the final result must be for the Korean people, the attempt to provide that Republic with international military sanctions may yet prove a tremendous achievement in the global struggle for peace or survival.

In view of this background, the present hysteria and efforts to find scapegoats for the loss of the battle in Korea must be regarded as signs of irresponsibility, unworthy of our obligations in the world. We need a reexamination and debate on foreign policy, not to determine how far we can safely shed our international responsibilities, but to determine how as a people we can measure up to the moral challenge presented to us by reason of our power.

We need to examine the fundamentals of our policy, to test them against the moral purposes we profess, and to keep them central in our strategy. At a time when the focus of attention is on military preparations, it is particularly important that the more basic preparations on the political, economic, and moral levels should not be neglected. The positive strategies of peace, like the Point IV program, should be kept in the forefront of policy, and military strategy be kept in an essentially subordinate position.

We also need to face up to the price of our responsibilities. They will call, as the Dun Commission stated, "for self-discipline and resolution and a tightening of our belts such as we have never achieved." Leaders of government must be prepared to lead boldly in asking our people to accept the heavy taxes, consumption restraints, and sacrifices required for a vigorous, long-range strategy for freedom. The public opinion polls indicated that the American people during the war and postwar years were more ready to shoulder the responsibilities of power than the political leaders were prepared to request. The same situation may well prevail today. Certainly only a bold and forthright policy can evoke the united response that the times require.

In the search for a fully responsible foreign policy and for the strong, unwavering support it requires, our churches have a major function to perform. It is through them and them alone that the well-springs of the faith that sustains American life and the moral vitality of our society can be renewed. It is through our churches, challenging the pretensions of national power and upholding the principle that power is a trust, that the moral foundations of policy can be undergirded. It is through our churches that individual citizens can gain a new sense of their own responsibility for national policy.

Correspondence

Dear Sir:

Permit me a brief comment on the apology for Nazism which Dr. Piper makes in *Christianity and Crisis* (December 25th issue).

The comparison between American ignorance of what has taken place in Porto Rico or in South Korea is thoroughly misleading. In addition to the fact of distance which separates America from the places alleged to be scenes of evil, there is the character of the evil, which in the case of Germany is without parallel in human annals.

However, the German people and certainly their leaders were fully aware of what was taking place, and profiting enormously from the crimes. Did not Germans witness and participate in the boycott of Jews, the burning of synagogues, the confiscation of Jewish property, the liquidation of Jewish business and the mass expulsion of Jews? Did the Germans never hear Hitler and his associates proclaiming destruction and death to the Jews?

Who, if not Germans, organized and administered such unprecedented barbarisms as Auschwitz, Treblinka and Madinek, where human beings were slaughtered with less compassion than animals are in Chicago?

Is it true that "their (the Nazi) philosophy was strictly ethical?" Was a violent crusade against Jews "ethical"; was it "ethical" to establish concentration camps for political dissenters; was it ethical to suppress freedom of conscience and liberty of thought? Was it ethical to invade Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Denmark? Was it ethical to strive for the mastery of the earth?

Another incredible statement is "the Nazis did not tell the people to commit crimes." If they did not tell them to commit crimes, just what did they tell them?

If an American of German origin or descent can entertain such delusions and can strive so fearfully to whitewash those who made the Nazi crimes possible, what may one expect from the Germans proper?

In the opinion of most American correspondents, the Germans have only one regret, namely that Hitler lost the war. They do not sorrow for the misery they brought upon the world, and for the destruction of the entire European Jewish community. They lament only their military defeat, and that is the real tragedy of Germany today.

THEODORE N. LEWIS

Brooklyn, New York

The World Church: News and Notes

"We Are Responsible for Peace," Prof. Hromádka

We are publishing herewith three news notes: from Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Zone of Germany, and Hungary, which reveal that the most stubborn resistance to Communism is coming from the Christians in Eastern Germany. On the other hand Professor Hromádka's statement from Czechoslovakia and the statement from the Hungarian Bishop show to what degree Christian leaders in these countries have accepted the Communistic viewpoint on world events.

Prof. Dr. Joseph L. Hromádka, Dean of the Comenius Faculty in Prague, spent two weeks in Hungary as the guest of the Hungarian Reformed Church. While in Budapest, he wrote an article entitled "We Are Responsible for Peace." It was published in the daily paper *Magyar Nemzet*. In his introduction, Dr. Hromádka pointed out that World War I was instrumental in destroying the relics of feudalism, thereby opening up magnificent opportunities of creative effort to the liberal *bourgeoisie* in Eastern and Western Europe. It is the ruling bourgeois groups and official Christianity that has to carry the immense amount of moral and political responsibility for the catastrophe which enveloped the world during the past two decades. This group was so anxious to preserve its goods and incomes that it preferred to help into the saddle the evil forces of fascism and nationalism, in order to turn the clock back. It helped to crush Spanish democracy. The labor parties in the West and in Middle Europe became willing tools in the hand of the *bourgeoisie*. Then Prof. Hromádka continues:

"But why should all this concern us, Christians? Do we really see clearly what we failed to see ten years ago and what millions of Christians throughout the whole world still fail to see? Do we realize that we, in the most decisive period of our country, failed to recognize our mission, or, owing to our weakness, we served the national and political interests of the ruling classes? Modern scepticism has weakened and emptied the faith of many of us. We have ceased to believe in God's Word, His promises and His judgment. For these people, Jesus Christ has become a piece of the distant past, a dead idea. Other Christians withdrew into the ivory tower of denominational and dogmatic exclusiveness; others have become petrified and do not have the least concern for what God is doing in the world of His creation. Still others of us wanted to help by preaching and sentimental phrases whereas it should have been the matter of taking the operating knife and cutting into the flesh of human society. The official Churches have grown together with the old social order, both in our towns and in the villages, so that they are just beginning to come to senses after the terrific concussions of the last years.

"We are on the threshold of a new historical period. It has come to the solving of the most important international problems. These months will decide the issue of war or peace. The situation is very grave. The events in Korea show that some governments do not

shrink back from the risk of war if it is the matter of stopping social progress. They 'solve' the problem of the Korean people without the participation of Democratic China and the Soviet Union and against the will of the Korean people as well as against the interest of the Asiatic peoples. It is a more important task than ever before to awaken the conscience of the world and to mobilize peoples for the defense of peace. We, believing Christians in this part of the world, remember with shame our individual and national sins and omissions and realize the truth that socialism is the force which pulls down the walls of prejudices and hatreds that stand between nations. Socialism lays the foundations of a new world. We, therefore, wish to help our brethren in other parts of the world in understanding the events of our days so that they may discover their own responsibility, stress the responsibility of their governments and may compel these to choose the right path.

"We are gladly greeting, therefore, the peace congress in Budapest and the World Congress of Peace in Sheffield, now in Warsaw. We wish that these conferences may rally all men of good will in this country and in the whole world for the defense of the great cause of peace. God's Word teaches us that peace and justice belong together. When we are fighting for peace we are fighting for justice; when we are fighting for justice we are fighting for peace. Let us accomplish what the previous generations failed to achieve."

—*Hungarian Church Press.*

East German Pastors Ask Anti-Communist Front

Eleven pastors of Evangelical parishes in the Soviet Zone have sent an open letter "to the Evangelical Church People in Western Germany" urging the creation of a "united national defense front against Communism."

"We don't preach a crusade against Stalin," the pastors' declaration said, "but we must not commit national suicide."

It urged West German churchmen "never to let us down in our fight against dictatorship," adding that lack of willingness for self-defense in the West only "encourages Soviet dictatorship to strengthen its despotism and to turn Germany into the theater of its next aggression."

Pointing to concentration camps, atheist education of youth and other phases of the Communist system in Eastern Germany, the letter said that "we Evangelical Christians in the Soviet Zone appeal to our brothers in faith in Western Germany."

"Even the strongest objections against rearmament of Western Germany must not seduce you to abandon our home country to the Communist terror without resistance," the pastors said. "Even the heaviest complaints about injustices and errors which the Western Occupation Powers may have committed must not close your eyes to the fact that the strength of the West is today our best, if not our only, hope to ward off the atheist Soviet imperialism."

"Therefore," the appeal urged, "place preparedness to defend our people high above all party conflicts and other considerations.

"He who takes a stand against the alleged remilitarization in Western Germany without protesting previously the rearmament in the Soviet Zone and the whole area under Soviet control, and he who fails to speak of the fate of our brothers in the uranium mines, in Soviet prisons and concentration camps on German soil, will arouse the suspicion that he is working for Stalin and Ulbricht (head of the East German Communist politbureau), even if his intentions are ever so honest.

"We therefore hope and expect that the esteemed Pastor Martin Niemoeller—particularly if he should speak to us in the East Zone—as an upright Christian will take as courageuos a stand against the anti-Church persecutions and war preparations of the Soviet-German rulers as he once fought injustice under Hitler and as he spoke against the Western powers during recent months."—*Religious News Service.*

Hungarian Bishop Affirms the New Order

Bishop John Péter of the Transtibiscan Synod declared in his first annual message:

"The right question for the Church today, at this time of emerging socialism, is this, in the sight of God and men: what is the help that can be rendered through us to this historical transition and to men involved in it? Inasmuch as our Church will live and serve by the full message of Jesus Christ, it will take part, in a beneficial way, in the events of this transition. While the Western churches and their theologians ought to seek the task of the Church by withdrawing from their environment and even declaring their distrust to this environment,—as the social, economic and cultural milieu there is headed for doom—our Church and our theologians should exercise their obedience by taking part in the movement of God's word and deed and so preparing the way for the new order of things. It is, therefore, a matter of believing obedience for us to seek, in this time of emerging socialism, those occasions of service whereby we can make our contribution to the building up of the new order. It is not enough to realize that the age of establishing socialism has arrived. And it is not merely a matter of indubitable facts, that we realize what good there is in this new order. We should pay attention, with full devotion, to all plans aiming at improving the conditions of human life and we should help these plans toward their best fulfilment. . . .

"I have just come home from the Peace Congress of Warsaw. I felt shame there seeing the resolute devotion of men ready to sacrifice their time, their life for the life of mankind, or warding off this danger of a new war. Soviet men and South American fighters for liberty, white men and colored men, colonial peoples and Westerners, pastors and priests of all Christian Churches, representatives of the religious movements of Asia—all these men, putting aside their differences and, I know by faith that in a manner pleasing to God—were at one in cooperating for the warding off that senseless and futile disaster that is being planned to save capitalism. In consideration of what suffering a new war would bring upon us, one is entitled to say that

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

the Warsaw Congress, this culmination of the movement starting with the Stockholm Peace Appeal, this merging of all honest and well-meaning efforts of mankind, was really one of the most significant and beautiful scenes of world history. A Church really caring for people rejoices in this, helps this movement, asks God's blessing upon it and works for its success. I am one of the three Hungarian representatives in the World Peace Council. I regard my membership in the Council as God's special and unmerited gift to me, and, in this situation, to my entire Church. . . ."—*Hungarian Church Press*

Bishop Hits German Unification at Any Price

Unification of Western and Eastern Germany at a price of "a fightless submission to Stalin's dictatorship" would be "a fatal mischief," according to Dr. Theophil Wurm, retired Bishop of Wurttemberg and former head of the Evangelical Church in Germany.

Writing in *Sonntagsblatt,* Evangelical weekly, Bishop Wurm declared that "without the recognition of the right of self-determination for citizens in Germany there is no real governmental authority, and without a recognition of the right of self-determination of peoples generally there is no world peace."

"All the hullabaloo about peace which does not include a protest against the enslavement of peoples, or parts thereof," Bishop Wurm said, "is hypocrisy and camouflaged preparation for war and civil war."

Bishop Wurm said he was in accord with Pastor Martin Niemoeller and the Brethren Council of the Confessional Church in demanding that such vital problems as the German contribution toward a defense front "against Eastern totalitarianism" should be aired in the open.

"I also agree with them," he stated, "that the Church has both the right and the duty to raise its voice if it has good reason to believe that something is happening, or may happen, which might bring new disaster upon Germany and the world."

Bishop Wurm said he regretted, however, that recent statements by Pastor Niemoeller and the Brethren Council seemed to have the appearance of judgments on political matters binding on the consciences of believers.

"Because of this," he added, "a confusion has been brought about which has done damage to the reputation of the Evangelical Church."—*Religious News Service*

American Czechs Protest

The National Union of Czechoslovak Protestants in the United States and Canada passed the following resolution:

On July 1 and 2, 1950, a "Peace Conference" of the Christian Churches of Czechoslovakia was held at Luhačovice, which adopted an Appeal to Christians throughout the world. In it, "the clergymen of all the Christian churches in Czechoslovakia" called upon the Christian world to "stand united in support of the Stockholm proclamation of the Permanent Committee of the World Congress of the Defenders of Peace," for "the capitalists, in a futile attempt to defend and increase their profits, want to drag mankind into a new war catastrophe. With unrestrained oppression and now with open aggression, the imperialists are trying to keep the enslaved nations in slavery."

Replying to this open challenge in behalf of the National Union of Czechoslovak Protestants in the United States and Canada, we express our profound sorrow that many of the official and unofficial leaders and representatives of the Catholic and Protestant communions have allowed themselves to become a tool of their communist government. We indeed pray for peace and strive for it; but not the sort of "peace" with which the Soviet imperialism wishes to beguile the unwary, both within and without the Christian churches, into a support of unpreparedness on the part of their peoples which should render the warlike designs of world communism more easily realizable.—In Behalf of the Executive Committee

DR. JAROSLAV MRÁZEK
President, The National Union of Czechoslovak Protestants in the U. S. and Canada

CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS - VOLUME X

Subject Index

CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS - VOLUME X

Title Index

CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS - VOLUME X

Author Index